1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
2			
3		X	
4	WEISS, et al.,	: :	
5	Plaintiffs,	: 05-CV-4622 :	
6	V.	: :	
7	NATIONAL WESTMINSTER BANK,	: 225 Cadman Plaza East : Brooklyn, New York	
8	Defendant.	: December 19, 2011	
9		X	
10	TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARILYN D. GO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
11			
12	APPEARANCES:		
13	For the Plaintiffs:	or the Plaintiffs: AARON SCHLANGER, ESQ.	
14		JOSHUA D. GLATTER, ESQ. OSEN LLC	
15		2 University Plaza Suite 201	
16		Hackensack, New Jersey 07601	
17			
18		LAWRENCE B. FRIEDMAN, ESQ. Cleary Gottlieb Steen &	
19		Hamilton LLP 1 Liberty Plaza	
20		New York, New York 10006	
21			
22	T. 2	SHARI RIEMER TypeWrite Word Processing Service 211 North Milton Road	
23			
24		Saratoga Springs, New York 12866	
25			

```
2
1
    [Proceedings began at 11:30 a.m.]
 2
              THE COURT: Weiss v. NatWest, Docket Number 2005-CV-
 3
    04622, Applebaum v. NatWest, Docket Number 2007-CV-00916.
              Will counsel appearing by telephone please state
 4
 5
    their names for the record? For the plaintiff.
 6
              MR. SCHLANGER: Aaron Schlanger on behalf of the
7
   Weiss plaintiffs. Also Joshua Glatter --
 8
              THE COURT: Why don't you speak up? Or I'll just ask
   you to identify yourselves when you do speak.
9
10
              THE COURT: Joshua Glatter and Joel Israel. For the
11
    defendant?
              MR. FRIEDMAN: Lawrence Friedman and Valerie
12
13
    Schuster, David Levy.
14
              THE COURT: I've taken a look at the motion papers.
15
    I'm going to grant the application. I'm not persuaded that
16
    the burden is that great. That's on the motion to compel that
    was filed on November 8<sup>th</sup>.
17
18
              MR. FRIEDMAN: May I ask, Your Honor. There were
19
    two applications or there were two formulas that plaintiff
20
    proposed. One was just to have us produce the rest of what's
21
    on the Goalkeeper system. The other was to have us go back
22
    and search documents that we searched before that will have to
23
    be taken out of archive and tapes will have to be examined.
24
    Can we limit the production to what's available on the
25
    Goalkeeper system and then without prejudice to them again
```

```
3
    coming back and saying if they need anything more? Otherwise
1
 2
    we're going to delay -- I fear we're going to delay the
 3
    summary judgment briefing schedule and hopefully plaintiffs
    will be satisfied by what's on the Goalkeeper system. And I
 4
    could get that to them within a week.
 5
              THE COURT: Okay. I think that's fair enough.
 6
 7
              MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
 8
              THE COURT: The supplemental protective order. I
9
    just want to make clear then, the appendix, the accounts and
10
    the annex are accounts that will not be protected; right?
11
              MR. SCHLANGER: That is correct, Your Honor.
12
              THE COURT: In toto, everything.
13
              MALE VOICE: No, no, no.
14
              MALE VOICE: It will just be the account numbers.
15
              MALE VOICE: It's the listed information about the
16
    account, not everything about the account.
17
              MALE VOICE: Can I just ask if counsel -- and this
18
    goes to my colleagues as well. Can you all just announce
19
    who's speaking at any given time because actually it's not
    always clear on this end of the connection.
20
21
              MR. FRIEDMAN: It's Larry Friedman. I think we're
22
    all agreed as the annex says that it's the information that is
23
    listed about the accounts, not everything about the accounts
24
    that need not be redacted.
25
              MR. SCHLANGER: This is Eric Schlanger. That's
```

4 correct. The annex is just a list of the account numbers and 1 2 I guess the name or type of account that is listed there which 3 was publicly available information. So only that issue would not be redacted but if there's other documents relating to the 4 account that would still be considered confidential. 5 THE COURT: So really you're talking about the 6 7 accounts and the account number, account names and the account 8 numbers? MR. SCHLANGER: That's correct. 9 10 THE COURT: Okay. It wasn't clear to me. I have you 11 talked about whatever procedures you're going to follow with 12 respect to -- I mean you have it in here but I guess what you 13 need to do is perhaps in a separate letter once you're more 14 certain about the preparation -- deadlines for completion of 15 the motion submissions to submit some sort of deadline for filing redacted copies. Do you need to have supervision over 16 17 the exchange of submissions and redactions? 18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, if I may just for 19 convenience. We've already served our initial motion papers 20 and I'll give you two dates if I may. The parties have agreed 21 that we will send, because we weren't sure when Your Honor 22 would enter this order --23 THE COURT: Yes. 24 MR. FRIEDMAN: We have agreed that we will provide 25 our proposed redactions on our motion papers to plaintiffs on

5 January 9 and they will send their responses on January 17th. 1 2 Otherwise what's provided in the order will govern. 3 Plaintiff's opposition is due on January 30 and I believe our reply is due February 29. So what the order provides will 4 5 govern but as the papers have already been served we've agreed 6 to January 9 and January 17. 7 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I think you've done a 8 good job trying to tailor what's protected and I appreciate 9 that. 10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. We wish you 11 the best of holidays. THE COURT: Same here. 12 13 MR. GLATTER: Your Honor, this is Mr. Glatter in New 14 York again. If I could ask Your Honor just on one question to 15 return to -- with respect to Your Honor's order on the motion to compel for the 2006 disclosure related documents. Certainly 16 17 as we know we don't have any opposition to defendant producing 18 the Goalkeeper report. Mr. Friedman indicated he could likely 19 produce any responsive materials of that nature in a week but 20 the one thing we would also ask is that it seems fair to ask 21 that to the extent that the Goalkeeper reports, which 22 presumably defendant will review before they produce them to 23 us, make reference to other documents. For example, referencing an email or some kind of other communication 24 25 exchange between employees at the bank.

We'd ask that the defendant at least make an effort to also identify and to the extent available produce those related communications that are referenced in the Goalkeeper reports to the extent that they may not necessarily have been literally scanned in, or if they're able to ascertain sourcing out and producing those related communications is difficult

But we think that's common sense and we'll hopefully mitigate the risk that we'll have to come back to Your Honor with additional motion practice pointing to materials that are referenced in these reports.

they can at least advise us of that.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Josh, if I may. Why don't we cross that bridge when we come to it and common sense will be my guide.

THE COURT: Okay. Without raising your hopes too much, Mr. Friedman, I have to say that I do think that what's being sought is at the outer limits of what's relevant even though I did find that documents outside of a one year period after the last attack would certainly have some -- could yield evidence on the state of mind of the defendant. It's not so clear to me that's what was produced would but be that as it may that's -- I don't have the complete knowledge that the plaintiffs have and if you do want to come back and ask for more you're going to have to explain a little more thoroughly to me.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I don't want to reargue the point, Your Honor, but you read our letter in which we noted that all the things Mr. Glatter cited in the 2006 disclosures that he thought gave a clue of relevance of underlying documents are facts that were already known to them but Your Honor has ruled and we'll put these documents together and we'll proceed from there. THE COURT: Okay. MR. GLATTER: Yes. I understand Your Honor's ruling and position and certainly we'll be mindful of your expectation going forward to the extent that there are any follow on requests that we are unable -- if any, that we'd be unable to consensually resolve with the defendant. THE COURT: All right. MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: So have a good holiday season.

I certify that the foregoing is a court transcript from an electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter. der Shari Riemer Dated: December 22, 2011